The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 10
No. 5

MARCH
1917

AN APPEAL FOR THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY

MISREPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

THE SUFFRAGE SIEGE OF THE WHITE HOUSE

HOW MILITANTS MAKE SPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

IN THE NAME OF HONEST LEGISLATION

FOR WOMAN'S SERVICE OR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

PATRIOTISM—AT A PRICE—UNMASKED

SUFFRAGISTS CAUGHT "TAKING CHANCES" WITH THE TRUTH

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1912, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Greenville, Del.; Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo, N. Dak.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. John Balch, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbot, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Plainfield, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. C. E. Estabrook, Milwaukee, Wis.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.
Miss N. V. Baker, Selma, Ala.
Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas, S. Dak.
Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville, Texas.
Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston, W. Va.
Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington, Iowa.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
First Vice-President, Lida B. Robertson, Mobile.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

President, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Murray Stewart.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell, Wilmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street, Washington.
President, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.
Treasurer, Miss Ayls Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George B. Fuller.
Recording Secretary, Miss Annie Squire.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
State Organizer, Mrs. S. C. Moore.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. R. J. Taylor.
Honorary Vice-President, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Chairman Finance Committee, Mrs. Charles Hilbun, Macon.

IOWA

Office: 1032 North Fourth Street, Burlington.
President, Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington.
First Vice-President, Miss Alice French, Davenport.
Secretary, Miss Mary Chittenden, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. F. I. Herriott, Des Moines.

MAINE

Honorary President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
President, Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, 94 Neal Street, Portland.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George E. Bird.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood, 206 State Street, Portland.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. Wm. H. Bradford.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.
Treasurer, Mrs. Rosalie Straus.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. W. P. E. Wyse, Pikesville.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. P. Lea Thom.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, 103 Read Street, Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.
President, Mrs. John Balch.
Chairman Executive Committee, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline, Mass.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Randolph Frothingham.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, Detroit.
First Vice-President, Mrs. L. E. Clark.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Recording Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.

MINNESOTA

Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. William Davis.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Ruth M. Currie, 302 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. C. C. George, 5218 Chicago Street.
Executive Committee, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Chairman.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
First Vice-President, Mrs. O. D. Felton, Concord.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carrie R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Anna L. Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. G. Herbert Smith, Summit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett, Trenton.
General Secretary, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Trenton.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles R. Smith, Ellison Street, Paterson.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 280 Madison Ave., New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. Eleanor G. Hewitt.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo.
First Vice-President, Mrs. N. C. Frick.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

Office: 1744 E. McMillan Street, Cincinnati.
President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
First Vice-President, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1108 Finance Building, 1426 South Penn Square, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
First Vice-President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
First Vice-President, Miss Louise C. Hoppin.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

SOUTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George B. Mansfield, Rapid City.
Secretary, Mrs. Elias Jacobsen, Pierre.
Treasurer, Mrs. S. S. Ruble.
Chairman Literature Committee, Mrs. E. B. Northrup.

TEXAS

President, Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville.
Vice-President, Mrs. George F. Arnold, 709 McKinney Avenue, Houston.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Post-office Box 368, Richmond.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherford.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Otho G. Kean.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WEST VIRGINIA

1102 Kanawha Street, Charleston.
Honorary Presidents, Mrs. A. B. Fleming, Fairmont; Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins.
President, Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Howard Simpson, Wheeling.
Treasurer, Miss Jean Brown, Charleston.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Mayo Tollman, Charleston.
Enrollment Secretary, Mrs. Joseph Gaines, Charleston.

WISCONSIN

President, Mrs. C. E. Estabrook.
First Vice-President, Miss Mary Atwood.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. F. W. Hoyt, Madison.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude Bean, 4 Prospect Ave., Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

AN APPEAL FOR THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY

By Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge
President National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

THE anti-suffrage cause is growing, not failing.

Ultimately, it *cannot fail.*

As a Representative declared to the Pennsylvania Legislature:

"Woman suffrage is wrong. No amount of argument can make it right."

All hope is based on the belief that wrong cannot ultimately triumph.

We know we are right.

We know that the majority of our people, men and women, are against woman suffrage.

We know that *the more people learn* of woman suffrage, the more useless, expensive, and inimical to the best interests of women it is and will be demonstrated.

We know that practical considerations of common sense, rather than mistaken chivalry or abstract sentiments, will ultimately decide this issue.

Two years ago, a New Jersey physician wrote:

"Nature herself is opposed to woman suffrage, and she will ultimately repeal it if adopted."

We have heard the rumblings of discontent in California, Illinois, Kansas.

We will hear more.

We know that the franchise cannot prove a *permanent* fetish, even for the few women so enthusiastic about it now. Sooner or later, the public will regard the professional female politician as more of a menace than the male.

The repeal of woman suffrage is a question of time. It is coming.

Women voted in Greece, they tried it in Rome.

They sat in the parliament of England three centuries ago. They voted in Austria until democracy demanded universal manhood suffrage, based on manhood service and responsibility.

Women voted in New Jersey in 1797. It was repealed ten years later, because of election frauds in which women politicians took prominent part.

Anti-suffragists are given a broad opportunity, they are called upon to defend the greatest issues.

Democracy itself is at stake.

The right of the people to rule; the right of State and Nation to representative government; the right to settle this question of suffrage in accordance with local conditions; the right of men to demand that the verdict of the voters be upheld; the right of women to claim their needed exemption from political duties by *"the law of majority rule,* the first principle of a republic," as Jefferson called it; the rights *reserved to the people* in State and Federal Constitutions.

All these rights are threatened with extinction.

The Million-Dollar-a-Year Suffrage Machine, with its coffers bulging with gold, its cohorts and lobbyists on the floors of every Legislature, is trying to carry out the destructive program of its president, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt.

On December 5, 1913, Mrs. Catt, then president of the International Suffrage Alliance, declared at a public meeting of the National Suffrage Association in Washington:

"If our constitution prevents our enfranchisement, I say, let us tear it into shreds and make a new one. Our cause can wait no longer. We must train our guns upon Congress, upon the South; we must train them even upon some members of our own organization, for we want freedom by Federal amendment—and we want it now."

This statement was published all over the country at the time, and excited strong denunciation from the press.

It is of much more significance now, because the suffragists are actively engaged in the attempt to put it into effect!

Immediately after an address by the President of the United States, at Atlantic City, September 8, 1916, and in his hearing, Mrs. Catt declared:

"If money talks, it tells us that when a movement can raise $800,000 in forty minutes, victory is not far away."

The suffragists believe that American men, *especially candidates and legislators,* are such weak-minded creatures that they will surrender any State to suffrage, in spite of the women, the voters, or the record of suffrage failure, if the "cause" raises money, makes a noise, promises votes and threatens politicians.

Every *true friend* of womanhood, of democracy, of representative government, of majority rule, or even of plain manliness and strength of character in public officials, should now do his or her utmost to oppose statutory suffrage by legislative enactment.

Such efforts are not in vain.

There will be referenda in Ohio, North Dakota and Arkansas.

The petitions for these referenda in Ohio and North Dakota are assured.

In Arkansas it requires only 5 per cent. of the voters on the petition (about 8,000 names). Ohio requires 6 and North Dakota 10 per cent.

The Indiana situation is being handled in a different manner, details of which cannot be published at the present time.

Let no anti-suffragist be discouraged.

Every State that has voted on suffrage since 1914 has defeated it.

The recent legislative enactment of partial suffrage in North Dakota, Indiana, Arkansas and Ohio has not enfranchised any women.

The gifts of the politicians will not be bestowed *if the people* and the courts refuse to ratify them.

Remember, however, that the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage is engaged in the most extended campaign in its history; that it is matched against a Million-Dollar-a-Year-Suffrage Machine; that it costs money to retain legal talent and active workers in several States at once; that referenda are expensive and that this organization is without adequate funds.

What will you do or give toward the maintenance of the family as the unit of society, toward the preservation of the legal exemptions and protections of the mother of the race; toward the support of local self-government; the conservation of womanhood and the defense of the democratic ideals on which the United States Government was established?

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart..Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. X March, 1917 No. 5

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

TRYING TO REVIVE OLIGARCHY

THE reactionary, undemocratic, and tyrannical nature of the suffrage campaign for the statutory franchise has never been revealed in more shameless manner than it is paraded in the current issues of two official suffrage organs, *The Woman's Journal*, of Boston, and *The Woman Voter*, of New York.

Both of these journals contend that no matter how the referenda in North Dakota, Ohio, etc., turn out, the legislatures of those States, under the constitution of the United States, have a right to disregard the will of the people!

("Presidential Suffrage Campaign," page 10, *Woman Voter*, March, 1917).

("Can it Be Annulled?" editorial, *Woman's Journal*, February 24th).

Both of these journals quote Article II, Section I, of the Federal Constitution:

"Each State shall appoint, in *such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct*, a number of electors, equal to the whole number," *et cetera*.

Neither journal sees fit to re-print Article IX of the original amendments:

"The enumeration in the constitution of certain rights *shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.*"

Nor Article X of the amendments:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are *reserved to the States* respectively, or *to the people.*"

Neither suffrage journal seems aware that every State except South Carolina provided for the choice of Presidential Electors by the constitutional voters of the State, even before the Civil War, and that since then, the right of the people to choose the Electors has not been questioned, except by the suffragists.

The argument that Congress and the Legislatures, under the United States Constitution, have a right to misrepresent the people, to enfranchise or disfranchise whom they please and as they please, regardless of State Constitutions or popular referenda, is not strange, coming from an organization believing "one woman in the world has a right to vote, if she desires it." But the argument is pernicious and dangerous to our institutions. It is un-American. It is the identical argument of the pacifist and of the filibuster—that the *ideas* of a few individual dreamers are more important than the *defense* of a Nation.

MISREPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

THE passage of the statutory suffrage bill through the Legislature of Ohio, after the voters of that State have defeated woman suffrage twice, by 87,000 majority in 1912 and by 182,000 in 1914; and after an enrollment of adult women in Ohio has shown 121,706 opposed to suffrage to only 12,147 in favor of it, is a worse blow to democracy and the fundamental principles of representative government than it is to the anti-suffrage association.

We shall have the whole thing referred again to the voters and defeated, but the Legislature of Ohio, with the exception of the manly representatives who voted against the measure, can never deny that it has betrayed the people on this question and forced upon them, while evading the Constitution, an extra expense and a useless experiment they have overwhelmingly rejected by popular vote. We simply fail to understand how men elected by majority rule can be so false to the ideals of representative government. Nothing we might say could be so forceful as one of the addresses on the referendum at the Constitutional Convention of Ohio, at Columbus, on March 12, 1912:

"The purpose of representative government is to represent, and that purpose fails when representatives misrepresent their constituents. Experience has shown that the defects of government are not in the people themselves, but in those who, acting as representatives of the people, embezzle power and turn to their own advantage the authority given them for the development of the public welfare. It has cost centuries to secure popular government, the blood of the best and bravest has been poured out to establish the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. All this struggle, all this sacrifice, has been in vain if, when we secure representative government, the people's representatives can betray them with impunity and mock their constituents while they draw salaries from the public treasury."

No stronger indictment of the Ohio statutory suffrage bill could be drawn.

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

THE right of self-government, operating through elected representatives, has been bought and paid for by the blood of men. Representative government is the only hope of democracy, the one hope of humanity struggling in great masses to attain and safeguard government of the people, for the people, by the people. The representative, elected by the people, is not a god, nor a law unto himself; he is the servant of the people, an employee of the people, the guardian of the sacred rights of the people. Properly estimated, every man elected to office, from President of the United States down, has been honored in a fashion never attained by royalty or monarchs—for the man holding political office in a democracy does so through the confidence and respect and admiration, not of his inferiors, but of his peers.

In spite of the recent and indisputable expressions of the people's will, the elected representatives of the people of Ohio have deliberately and defiantly repudiated the people's verdict, ridden roughshod over the heads of the people and forced this pernicious thing down their throats.

This presents a splendid opportunity for the enemies of democracy, ever on the alert, to gloat over the failure of representative government. No student of government can deny that this performance of the Ohio Legislature is the most glaring and brazen outrage ever perpetrated upon an American public. No political situation on the modern horizon approaches in seriousness and black menace this revolt of the Ohio Legislature against the people of Ohio. There is a wide crack in the structure of democracy; and the horror of it is, that the soft hands of women are pushing us on to destruction. Beside this profanation, the childish antics of the English militants were mild and puerile.

Perhaps the legislators of Ohio are to be more pitied than scorned. The suffrage organizations of the country have instituted a reign of the highly financed female lobby—and we may well imagine that where one man succumbs to threats, the next is captured by blandishment. What do the wives of legislators think of a perpetual female lobby?

The fact remains, however, that in Ohio the representative has misrepresented and betrayed his constituents. The suffragist has made of the people's representative a catspaw. A precedent has been established—more menacing than any submarine to the life of democracy.—CHARLOTTE E. ROWE.

THE SUFFRAGE SIEGE OF THE WHITE HOUSE

ON the day after eleven men attempted to deny the President of the United States the right to defend the country, a body of women, claiming to represent the women voters of the eleven full-suffrage States, achieved the climax of the campaign of organized annoyance they have waged against the President of the United States for four years. They are proud of it. "Solidarity of sex" is their creed. "Pester the President" is their chief policy.

For six weeks they posted "sentinels" at the White House gates. At first there were six sentinels on duty at once. Later the number was reduced to four. There were not enough women willing to take part in picketing to maintain the original number.

But the great "demonstration" was to come on March 4th. "Ten thousand women" were to raid the White House on that date, according to schedule. "Come in thousands," declared the big yellow sign at the "Little White House," the headquarters of the Congressional Union and Woman's Party.

"Come to the White House," they asked in circulars distributed in every section where the Congressional Union is organized, "and join a delegation led by Miss Anne Martin and Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, who will ask that women be enfranchised before action is taken by the government on war or any other question."

In other words, they asked their sisters to help them paralyze the government until they get what they want. The spirit of the filibuster, the pacifist, the anarchist, was theirs. "Adopt our views," was their cry, "before you carry on government or provide for national defense."

How did the great "demonstration" turn out? Three hundred and thirty-eight women, with that many Pankhurst flags, marched around the White House four times in the rain.

Originally, they had planned to circle the grounds seven times, in imitation of Joshua and his followers marching around the walls of Jericho. They expected, they said, that the President would thereupon come out and invite them in "to have some suffrage."

As a matter of fact, policemen were stationed around the White House, with orders to let no pickets within. All gates were kept locked. When a deputation of suffragists sought an audience with the President it found its way barred. Then the police sergeant in charge at the gate was asked to take a letter and a copy of a set of resolutions to the President. He accepted them, but stated that they could not be delivered even to the President's Assistant Secretary, until he went off duty. He could not assure them when the papers would reach the President.

Meanwhile, as this parley was going on, the President and Mrs. Wilson passed out of the White House grounds in their automobile, ignoring the suffragists and their dripping banners utterly.

This was before the White House had been encircled twice.

But the paraders, drenched to the skin, were marched around four times. Many deserters and stragglers fell out each time. One hired a street urchin to take her place in line. The Washington *Post* describes it as follows:

All types of women, as well as all ages, were represented in the column. There were those who in the words of the comic opera artist had "eaten themselves all out of shape," and frail figures that staggered under the water-soaked tricolor.

Dress was as varied as type. While the majority of the marchers came clad for the weather in slickers, small hats and galoshes, there were some, evidently working in the interest of the millinery trust and shoe dealers' combine, who paraded great picture creations and slopped through the puddles in suede shoes.

That the colors ran was literally true, and to be perfectly frank and probably "cattish" not all of the running color came off the banners. Some of it came off the bureau, but though, like unexperienced soldiers, they failed to "keep their powder dry," these marchers did not permit their spirit to become dampened. They, in the words of one of their number, "bore up bravely" even while panting under their burdens on the fourth encirclement of the executive grounds.

One mere man had the temerity, or possibly the timidity, to march with the women. He did not bear a banner, but walked with bowed head beside a militant visaged banner bearer, and protected her upstanding plumes from the rain.

Half a dozen children or more were in line carrying banners. One of these, at least, was admitted at the public meeting to be only ten years old.

As an aside on the "mother spirit" suffrage would bring, one might reflect upon the fact that it would be almost impossible to find a father foolish enough to make his ten-year-old daughter carry a banner in a cold rain to advertise his politics!

Several persons commented upon the selection of Sunday for this political demonstration. The socialists and the suffragists are the only political organizations which conduct mass-meetings, parades, etc., on the Sabbath.

The text of the resolutions presented is not worth reproduction in the columns of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST. They simply affirm that the Woman's Party is "unalterably convinced" that it should work for Suffrage First, and demand the "immediate passage of the national suffrage amendment."

The following comment was made by prominent women at the National capital:

Mrs. Robert W. Lansing, wife of the Secretary of State, and daughter of Hon. John W. Foster, said: "I strongly disapprove of their actions, especially at this time. I would have to weigh my words very carefully to express my full opinion of it."

Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, wife of Senator Wadsworth, of New York, and daughter of John Hay, said:

"It is a part of the suffrage program as unpatriotic as it is futile. Their persistent persecution of the President is most unreasonable and childish. It is indicative, in my opinion, of the tactics these women would adopt after they had the vote. They would never accept anything as decided, by the votes of the people, or in the mind of a public official, but would attempt to gain their ends by forms of organized annoyance. I noted, after our frequent criticisms of them for not displaying the American Flag, that they now have one United States Flag, and used one in the parade—one among three hundred and thirty-eight flags such as Mrs. Pankhurst used. This, it would seem, shows their percentage of Americanism. Militants who put suffrage first, and annoy the President at such a time, disgrace womankind, and have no right to use an American flag."

Mrs. Wadsworth is president of the District of Columbia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Mrs. William Phillips, wife of the Third Assistant Secretary of State, said:

"Mrs. Wadsworth has expressed my opinion. I thoroughly disapprove of such methods by women."

Mrs. Mahlon Pitney, wife of Supreme Court Justice Pitney, said: "I do not see how it can help their cause."

Mrs. Augustus P. Gardner, wife of Representative Gardner, of Massachusetts, said:

"I think it was most undignified and discreditable. It is not the way for women to arrive at anything they desire, but a way for them to discredit their sex."

Mrs. George B. Puller, 1743 18th street, an officer of the local anti-suffrage association, said:

"The suffragists set an extremely dangerous example to men in politics. They have created a precedent which may lead to attempts on the part of radical men to take similar actions, and we know in that case this might cause arrests or riots."

Mrs. Edward F. Dickinson, of Massachusetts, declared:

"It is a disgrace to womankind that there are any women to annoy the chief executive in these perilious times."

Mrs. Arthur Dunn, chairman of the executive committee of District Anti-Suffrage Association, said:

"Women who indulge in such childish stunts show themselves unfit for any duty, political or domestic. It was a pitiable exhibition of mental inefficiency."

"It was a most useless expression of what women can do," asserted Mrs. Joseph Stoddard. "There is no doubt that women can do almost anything that man can do, but there was no need to demonstrate that grown women also can act like children. For a woman to go where she is not wanted is an affront to the dignity of all women."

Miss Murray Ledyard asked:

"Why do these women waste their time insulting the President of the United States? What would happen if everyone who wanted a bill passed by Congress tried these militant methods? There is too much of this spirit in politics now. Women are needed for other things. From a suffrage point of view, it was a most foolish thing, and some of the suffragists are conservative enough to realize it."

HOW MILITANTS MAKE SPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

THE first surprise to an observer at the meeting of the Congressional Union and Woman's Party, Sunday March 4, at the National Theater, Washington, was the relatively small number of persons present.

None was in the second balcony.

Seats were advertised beforehand for 25 cents to $1.00. Yet a representative of the WOMAN'S PROTEST, at 8:15, was given a free seat next to a box, only ten rows from the stage.

A clever suffrage scheme was used to disguise the number of persons in the house. Suffrage flags were lashed to each seat, so that it was difficult to determine whether a row was filled or not. In the writer's opinion, there were from 15 to 20 per cent. fewer people at this meeting than at the convention of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, held in the same theater December 7, 1916.

From first to last, the meeting was devoted to attacks on President Wilson and explanations of the Union's policy of annoying him. Some of these attacks bristled with thinly veiled insult and ridicule. Miss Lucy Burns, vice-chairman of the Congressional Union, presided. The first speaker introduced was Miss Maud Younger of California, who is officially rated as head of the national lobby department of the Congressional Union.

Miss Younger began her speech with a reference to the President as "A certain citizen of New Jersey, Mr. Wilson."

"Four years ago," she said, "Mr. Wilson arrived in Washington for the Inauguration. He expected a lot of people to meet him at the station. The streets were deserted by the station, and Mr. Wilson asked: 'Where are the people?'"

"'On the Avenue watching the suffragists," he was told.

"From that day the demand of American women for the franchise has confronted Mr. Wilson, afterwards President Wilson, wherever he turned."

From this point onward, the attack on the President proceeded.

"We have centralized power more strongly entrenched in the White House than ever," Miss Younger asserted. "The President, though his power of appointment, has tremendous influence over Congress. The Congressman, you know, must stand in with the President to get the persons he wants appointed."

In other words, Miss Younger strongly intimated that the President was being persecuted because he failed to use patronage to force the Federal amendment! And this is "purified politics!"

"We have given the President every chance in the world," Miss Younger added. "We know that the President has a great mind, and that great minds, like plants, should be cultivated with care and attention. We are cultivating Mr. Wilson's."

She thereupon began to intimate that the President is insincere in his reasons for opposing the Federal amendment.

She declared that he had been forced to abandon the principle of State rights. She quoted him as telling Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch (July 24, 1916) that he was not opposed to the Federal amendment on account of State rights, but because of the negro question.

Then, Mrs. Younger said, Mrs. Blatch told him that woman suffrage would increase white supremacy in the South.

"I know that, but Congress doesn't," she quoted the President as saying.

As it happens, the WOMAN'S PROTEST is in a position to challenge this statement. When it appeared in the press, shortly after the deputation of suffragists visited the President, a copy was sent to Mr. Wilson asking him to confirm or deny it, and saying that his reply would not be used during the Presidential campaign. Under date of October 14, 1916, Secretary Tumulty wrote to a representative of our Data Department:

"The President directs me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of October 3d, and to say that he has no recollection of making such a statement as that which you quote."

That women should misquote the President of the United States in order to attempt to make his position on a great governmental question appear insincere and merely a matter of political exigency may cause some surprise to persons unfamiliar with the suffrage system of saying anything that will "help the cause." Anti-suffragists, who have known suffrage leaders to juggle the truth to fit their ends whenever necessary, are not astonished. As for the negro question, it is sufficient to quote Miss Laura Clay of Kentucky, a suffragist, to the effect that the advocates of the Federal amendment have constantly published "statistical absurdities" on this issue in the South.

The other speakers, Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles and Mrs. Fola LaFollette, also attacked the President or pleaded for the continuance of the "suffrage-first" policy.

Mrs. Hilles, speaking to about 1,500 persons, addressed them: "Men and women of the United States."

She explained that the Union could not divert itself to anything other than national propaganda. She praised the pickets as press agents.

"We never could have gotten our message to the people without pickets," she declared. "Whenever we wanted to say anything to the people, all we had to do was to put it on a picket's banner and the press would carry it all over the country." President Wilson, she asserted, could have given orders to pass the Federal amendment, "and in forty-five minutes it would have gone through."

The conception these women have of Congressional procedure would fit nothing but an absolute monarchy or a doll's house.

Mrs. Fola LaFollette made a specious plea for the Federal amendment. She announced:

"We are not only for the Federal amendment, but we are

opposed to the waste of energy of State referenda. We are not content with partial enfranchisement. There isn't any giving us half of what we want. We demand the whole loaf and we are going to get it. We are the radicals.

"The solidarity of women of the United States has been established in an epoch-making fashion," she declared.

The absurdity of this statement is so evident, in the face of the failure of the Woman's Party to "solidify" the women's vote in 1916, the well-known division of women on suffrage, and, within suffrage ranks, on pacifism, the Federal amendment, etc., that a careful mind is unable to see how any informed woman could make it.

Mrs. LaFollette asserted that it was possible to convert every man to woman suffrage, but argued that it is a waste of time. She said that the suffragists in Ohio converted 100,000 men between 1912 and 1914. She did not, hovewer, giver her hearers adequate or correct information on this point. As a matter of fact, the suffrage vote increased from 249,420 to 335,290, and the anti-suffrage vote from 336,875 to 518,295. No fair statement could be made without mentioning the anti-suffrage gain of 181,420, as well as the suffrage gain of 85,870.

It is such "statistical absurdities" as this, suppressing always an important part of the facts, that make anti-suffragists disgusted with the manner in which their opponents juggle the truth. Oviously, there was no real suffrage gain in "converts" when the antis were converting more than twice as many voters as the cause, yet it was to make this impression that the figures were used.

Mrs. LaFollette declared that the rights of ninety-five counties in Iowa were violated by the anti-suffrage majorities in four counties. This also is a juggle. Of the ninety-nine counties in Iowa, fifty-two defeated the amendment, and forty-seven counties favored it. It is true that the majority is represented by four—or five—counties, but this sort of manipulation is exactly on a par with a claim that one State in the Union violated the will of forty-seven because a change in the Ohio vote would have defeated the President for re-election!

After Mrs. LaFollette's speech, pledges were made. Of the $51,000 pledged, $15,000 was given by Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont. One lone woman offered to pledge a sum as a "friend of Mrs. Wilson."

"Has Mr. Wilson got any friends here?" taunted the speaker.

Apparently he had none.

All persons who desire to maintain the dignity of the greatest elective office in the world, that of Chief Executive of the United States, should seriously ponder the drift of a movement which has led American women, at a time of national crisis, to conduct such a meeting, after a raid on the President's home, merely to make sport of him, and to get newspaper notoriety for themselves, even though he believes in woman suffrage.

IN THE NAME OF HONEST LEGISLATION

A Statement by the Hon. Harry Israel, Member Ohio House of Representatives

IN the name of honest and uncoerced legislation in the State of Ohio, I, Harry Israel, do herewith protest against the tactics being used by some of the suffrage lobbyists, in an effort to intimidate, allure and coerce the members of the legislative body to vote for the Presidential Suffrage Bill.

I unhesitatingly declare, and have witnesses to back my assertion, that one of the Dayton licensed lobbyists came upon the floor of the House of Representatives, displayed her license to myself and others, and in her official capacity engaged me in conversation upon the question of woman suffrage. When I made it known to her that I should oppose the bill for which she was lobbying she indignantly denounced my position, accused myself and others opposed to the measure of gross ignorance, and warned me that her own financial resources to a moderate amount and those of her husband's family and her own family in large amounts would be available for the defeat at re-election of any legislator who dared vote against the woman's suffrage measures.

One of the arguments used in attempting to induce me to vote for woman suffrage was that she declared the opponents of suffrage were favorable to legislation which I oppose, which gave additional evidence of the unfair tactics resorted to by women in politics in utter disregard of law, precedent and custom.

I feel that no representative and no senator should be subjected to the foregoing tactics and to threats which are equal to bribes. A legislator should be permitted to do his honest duty by the State and by his constituents, to the best of his ability and as his conscience may dictate, without intimidation of any sort.

(Signed) Harry Israel.

OHIO EDITORIAL OPINIONS

A REFERENDUM ON SUFFRAGE

THE passage of the Universal Presidential Suffrage Bill by the Ohio General Assembly was accompanied by the statement on the part of its feminine opponents that it would be subjected to a referendum of the people. Inasmuch as the people of Ohio have twice rejected woman suffrage within a few years, it does not appear that the fate of that reform was definitely settled by the enactment of the Reynolds bill.

But whether it is or not, and regardless of the question as to whether there will be a referendum, the fact remains, and is substantiated by all reliable reports from the State capital, that the vote on the bill in both the House and Senate was largely influenced by the prospect of a referendum. In other words, representatives and senators did not as a whole vote their convictions on the bill, but looked to the referendum as the final method of disposing of the proposed reform.

—*Toledo, Ohio, Times,* Feb. 20, 1917.

REVERSING THE PEOPLE

SPEAKING of woman suffrage, the New York *Times* says: "States which do want it are pretty quick about granting it, and even States which do not want it. Of the latter Ohio seems to be one; every time the question has come before the voters they have voted against woman suffrage—the first time by 87,455 majority, the second time by 182,905. The Legislature, in enacting it now, reverses the decision of the voters."

The *Times* seems never to have heard of certain interesting and even important features of Ohio's fundamental law.

It says that "the Legislature now reverses the decision of the voters." As a matter of fact, the Legislature reverses nobody. It allowed itself to be bullied by a particularly vociferous suffrage lobby. But the people of Ohio have reserved to themselves certain rights, and they will say for themselves who is to be reversed when the Reynolds bill comes up for final decision at the polls next November.—*Times-Star,* Feb. 19, 1917.

FOR WOMAN'S SERVICE OR WOMAN SUFFRAGE?

WHETHER the United States goes to war or maintains armed neutrality, we will see the suffragists loudly demanding the franchise as a reward for the services of all *women* to the Nation. Therefore, it is important that the beginning of the record be set straight.

These are the facts:

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has been on record for preparedness for over a year. For more than eight months, the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has been pledged not only for preparedness, but to active co-operation with other patriotic enterprises to forward, organize and perfect woman's service to her country.

This point should be noted. In THE WOMAN'S PROTEST for July, 1916, the reader will find the original "America First" resolution—and this distinct statement:

"Co-operation with existing agencies will be the keynote of anti-suffrage activity. Nothing will be done to overlap or duplicate the work of other patriotic associations."

From the address of Miss Mabel Boardman, of the Executive Committee of the American Red Cross, and that of Mrs. Margaret Robinson, president of the Public Interest League of Massachusetts, we know how anti-suffragists have helped and co-operated with the Red Cross.

When the National League for Woman's Service was organized in January, under the auspices of the Congress for Constructive Patriotism, anti-suffragists immediately began to work for and with it, *not as anti-suffragists*, but as American women. The first copies of the Emergency Program to be printed appeared as reprints of a feature article in THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, last month.

Now let us get the suffrage side of it straight.

The National League for Woman's Service is no more anti-suffrage than the Red Cross or the United States Government is anti-suffrage. It is American, that is all. Suffragists and anti-suffragists, democrats and republicans, women of all creeds and classes, can co-operate to serve their country.

The first meeting called by the organization committee of the league after it was formed in Washington was held February 5, at the home of Mrs. William K. Vanderbilt, New York. All the morning papers of February 6 carried long articles about it. On the same date, the president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, who attended the first meeting, said in an interview: "It is now America First and Anti-Suffrage Second."

The afternoon of the day on which all this publicity about the league appeared (February 6), the New York State Woman Suffrage Party held an executive meeting, and voted to offer its services to the Governor. Knowing the National League for Woman's Service was a new organization, the New York State suffragists over-shadowed it by offering a large number of women (500,000), "thoroughly organized and highly trained in co-operative work," to the State.

Strangely enough, the membership of the New York Woman Suffrage Party, including *men* and women who had signed suffrage slips, was given as 212,223 in the "Stock Accounting of the Party" in the official organ, *The Woman Voter*, for February, 1916. During the big campaign of 1915, only 60,535 names were added to the 151,688 previously enrolled men and women. A year ago, the president of the State Woman Suffrage Party told the New York Legislature that she represented 200,000 women. But they claim to have 500,000 now.

Were 300,000 women "thoroughly organized and highly trained in co-operative work" during 1916 by the New York suffragists? And no publicity about it?

The suffrage offer of services, however, obtained good publicity.

The "500,000" appeared in all the headlines, but not *one word* was said about the National League for Woman's Service in this publicity put out by the suffragists. It was ignored.

One suffrage association which offered its women to a State was visited by an official engaged in active preparedness, who asked:

"How many of your women are willing to help us? We need many."

"Oh," replied the suffrage president, "we offered our services only in case of war."

However, it is only fair to remark that many individual suffragists are eagerly co-operating, not competing with the National League for Woman's Service.

By February 8, the pacifists among the suffragists started to protest.

Twenty-two of them resigned from the party on that date, making indignant protest against the offer of services. One of them inadvertently "gave away" the secret of the "highly trained" 500,000. She said: "When we signed that little yellow slip we said we believed in suffrage and most of us promised to work for it. There was nothing about offering our services to city, state or nation."—New York *Herald*, February 9.

Does "signing that little yellow slip" make a woman "thoroughly organized and highly trained in co-operative work," as stated by the Executive Committee of the New York Woman Suffrage Party?

Is it not like Mr. Bryan's famous army of a million men raised in one day? Mr. Bryan's army is ready to fight, to leap to arms, when the country is invaded, but it is not willing that the arms be made beforehand, nor that the army be assembled in times of peace to learn to use the arms.

The pacifist resignations created a sensation in suffrage ranks.

One woman wrote:

"I do not grant that the executive board of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party is empowered to represent the suffragists of the State in any way other than in relation to woman suffrage."

Another group wrote to the president of the State suffrage party:

"You have misrepresented the position of a large number of suffragists. You have exceeded your authority . . . You have not, apparently, made the slightest effort to find out what any part of the membership really thought about war. You have simply promised to hand over to the government what is not yours to give. Your betrayal of our cause is inexcusable."

The Woman's Journal, therefore, with unusual caution, proclaimed on its first page, February 17, that "Women Will Help When Aid is Asked." Miss Rose Young was quoted as expressing "a very general feeling" as follows:

"Women are averse to war. They are averse to the creation of a war psychology in advance of the event. They deprecate ill-considered war talk in the name of patriotism. They want peace. They work for peace. They pray for peace. If peace can be compelled, they will compel it. But suffragists have shown that women may be relied on to rise to the support of their country if war can no longer be averted."

In other words, suffragists will serve if they have to, like everybody else, but they are not in favor of the preparedness necessary to render them efficient for service, for fear of creating a "war psychology."

PATRIOTISM—AT A PRICE—UNMASKED

ON February 11th, less than a week after the famous suffrage offer of 500,000 women, a group of men, headed by a prominent banker, telegraphed the New York State Legislature:

The time is ripe for granting suffrage to the women of this State, not only because of the intrinsic justice of the cause, but in view of the possible further burdens to be carried by women in this country.

It is also asserted that "the woman suffragists of the State have within the last week shown themselves capable of rising above merely political considerations," and "the time has come for men to take the lead in the woman's cause." The following reply was made February 12th by Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, and by Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, president of the New York State Association:

CAUSE OF SUFFRAGE, NOT WOMAN

It is plain that these men are taking the lead in the cause of suffrage, not of woman. It is astonishing to find them seriously arguing that "in view of possible further burdens to be carried" women should forthwith be thrust into the turmoil of politics and burdened in addition with the ballot.

If certain suffragists for once have shown themselves capable of "rising above merely political considerations," would it not seem reasonable to allow them to remain above political considerations, with the majority of women who wish to retain this high estate?

The recent offer of the executive committee of the New York suffragists to serve the Government in the event of war (the Government undoubtedly has the power to compel women to serve in time of war, and women have always willingly served) is no reason or excuse for the imposition upon all women of a burden without benefit to themselves or the State, and from which the Government and the voters of this State have declared women exempt.

The National and the New York State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage have been on record for adequate national defense for more than a year, and our national organ and our twenty-five State organizations have constantly worked to arouse the women of the country to this great national need. Should the vote be imposed upon the 2,800,000 women of New York as an additional burden on them and the taxpayers, merely because a committee of suffragists, claiming to represent 500,000 women, many of whom are pacifists and protest against their action, has offered at least to serve the State the same as their sisters have?

While unwilling to believe that women would use such an offer of services as a method of political propaganda, or to capitalize their country's crisis to advance their cause, it is difficult to draw any other inference from the rapid sequence of action by the men and women suffragists.

To avoid any such inference on the part of the public, the suffragists should forthwith abandon their political activities, announce a truce, and join us in non-partisan service to our common country. Are they willing with us to give up politics for patriotism? If they are not, the suffrage offer of services and the men's telegram stand unmasked.

The above statement, signed by Mrs. Dodge and Miss Chittenden, appeared in part in the New York *Sun*. The suffragists have not replied.

PACIFISM SACRIFICED FOR SUFFRAGE PUBLICITY

THE suffragists, apparently, were not willing to give up politics for patriotism. But they seem quite willing to lose a few pacifists for publicity. On Sunday, February 25th, the National Suffrage Association offered some more service to the Government at a meeting of one hundred of its officers in Washington. It passed a set of resolutions, starting with the sentence:

We devoutly hope and pray that our country's crisis may be passed without recourse to war. We declare our belief that the settlement of international difficulties by bloodshed is unworthy of the Twentieth Century.

With no intention of laying aside our constructive, forward work to secure the vote for the womanhood of this country, the resolution continued, we pledge the loyal services of our more than two millions of members. We make this offer now in order to avoid waste of time and effort in an emergency; also that the executive ability, industry and devotion of our women, trained through years of arduous endeavor, may be utilized with all other national resources, for the protection of our country in its time of stress.

Then the proposal is made "That a national central committee be formed at once, composed of a representative from each national organization of women willing to aid in war work if the need arises."

As a matter of fact, such an organization *had been formed a month before* the suffragists recommended that it be formed "at once"—*The National League for Woman's Service*—but this organization of women is not mentioned, either in the *Woman Voter*, which devotes a whole page to the national suffrage offer under the title of "Constructive Patriotism," or in the *Woman's Journal*, which has had three front-page stories about woman's service in the last month!

Why? The answer would be interesting. Is it because the league is purely patriotic, and not political?

It is also significant that another large number of women (2,000,000) have been "trained through years of arduous endeavor."

On April 19, 1913, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, according to the *Congressional Record*, said:

"I am the president and these are the representatives of a national society, numbering more than 240,000 co-operative members and more than 40,000 paid members."

The delegate representation of paid members at the National Suffrage Convention in Nashville in 1914 was for 40,000 or less. The delegate representation of paid members at the National Suffrage Convention at Atlantic City in 1916 was for 75,000 or less. If the ratio of increase, and the ratio of paid members to "co-operative members" has held out, the National American Woman Suffrage Association has about 450,000 "co-operative members" to-day, instead of "more than two million." According to Dr. Shaw's figures in 1913, over 1,750,000 of these alleged two million members must have joined, and have been "trained through years of arduous endeavor" since that time! The two million claim probably comes from the fact that the General Federation of Women's Clubs, having that membership, indorsed woman suffrage in 1914. The claim was made immediately afterwards, although many members of women's clubs are anti-suffragists, and several State associations have refused to indorse suffrage. It may also be based on the fact that from 1,850,000 to 1,950,000 women voted in the West in 1916. At least, it is a large number, approaching the membership of the American Federation of Labor, and exceeding the membership of the Socialist Party. Besides, it sounds well.

The "2,000,000" also were featured in the headlines.

Nevertheless, it is impossible to get even the cheapest publicity without some cost. On March 6th, the president of the National Suffrage Association, on account of the offer, was defeated for re-election as vice-president of the so-called "Woman's Peace Party," an organization formed two years ago to advance woman suffrage under another name with the women of war-stricken Europe. (See WOMAN'S PROTEST, July, 1915, "The Peace Party Fiasco.")

THE NEW SUFFRAGE SCHEME EXPLAINED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE.

SIR: The statements of Mrs. John Rogers, Jr., a leader of the National Congressional Union, reported in the press of February 11 that "war is hell foolery," that "the United States should be kept out of war, no matter what happens," and that she "will give no service of any kind to a country which violates the rights of women by refusing them political freedom," confirm my discoveries, made last year, when I withdrew from the suffrage movement.

I then found that the movement is largely a pacifist-socialist affair, as has just been shown by the storm of suffragist opposition which has arisen to the declaration of loyalty made recently by Mrs. Catt, Mrs. Whitehouse and a few members of the suffrage party. My former associates could not be made to see that a woman's first duty is to declare her loyalty to the government in which she is asking a voice; therefore I left them.

Mrs. Whitehouse, who has recently recanted, last winter refused to assist the movement for national preparedness, saying that she would not do so until the vote had been given to women. Mrs. Catt, Dr. Shaw and Jane Addams, among others, decried the wisdom of making any preparation for military eventualities, and Mrs. Catt told us that it was "written on the wall of time that war is a relic of barbarism and must go," and intimated that women, if given the vote, could be depended upon to see to war's going.

We now see the method of war's dissipation which these women saviors of mankind had in view. They were to lie, Bryan-like, on their backs, with their hands folded in prayer, while the enemy should bundle them up like cordwood and toss them on to our national pyre. This was their fair dream of martyrdom—until the German Ambassador was given his passports and the dream began to look like reality. Then suddenly a new legend appeared upon the wall of time, reading, "This way to the tall timber," when Mrs. Catt, Mrs. Whitehouse and the more agile of their associates were to be seen hurrying for the trees.

Where this leaves Mrs. Catt's deluded but less nimble followers we need not ask. All that it is now charitable to inquire is, How shall they, too, be got out of the arena of martyrdom before the hungry animals are let in?

ELIZABETH OGDEN WOOD.

—*New York Tribune*, Feb. 24, 1917.

TO the Editor of the New York *Times:*

Miss Alice Carpenter concludes her letter in to-day's *Times* with the words:

"If hostilities come I am confident that the women of America will give a good account of themselves. * * * All the more reason, therefore, for giving them the ballot."

But of these women who "will give a good account of themselves" the majority will be anti-suffragists. Why should their "reward" so clamorously asked for by pacifists and suffragists be the ballot, which they do not want? It is about time that suffragists should cease claiming the ballot because anti-suffragists have proven their patriotism. Remember, there is not one prominent pacifist who is an anti-suffragist—or if there be one, she has not made herself heard. The leaders among the pacifists are all also leaders among the suffragists.

Remember, although the offering of service to the nation in its hour of peril has rent the suffrage party in twain, the National Association of Anti-suffragists put themselves officially on record at their congress, last December, as in favor of universal training, and have been ardently supporting preparedness since the outbreak of the European war.

ANNIE NATHAN MEYER.

New York, February 20, 1917.

A MESSAGE FROM ONTARIO

[On February 27, the Government of Ontario, Canada, accepted two bills to extend to women the right to vote in Provincial and municipal elections, the Premier pleading that the suffrage should be bestowed by legislative enactment, rather than have a referendum at this time. "The number of voters added to the suffrage rolls in Toronto will be about 64,861," says the Toronto *Daily* Star. "At the last New Year's election less than 1,000 women voted. On a percentage basis at least 3,000 should vote at the next opportunity." The following letter describes the methods used to obtain woman suffrage in a community at war, where about one woman in twenty is thought to want the vote enough to use it.—EDITOR]

Toronto, Canada, Feb. 28, 1917.

THERE will be much rejoicing, no doubt among your suffragists, that Ontario has declared for suffrage. To those who know all the inside working it is a matter for no rejoicing, but for real sorrow that politicians can use their trust to thrust upon a whole province such a drastic change when they themselves have declared that they did not consider it for the good of the country but they thought the people wanted it! Meaning in plain English that a very weak government is willing to do anything to save its shaking political skin.

While the anti-suffragists have been working to the verge of nervous prostration at war work the extreme section of the suffragists have been stump speaking throughout the country and trying to get a monster petition signed. They could get no kind of real support, in most towns they retired with only a few if any signatures. On all sides there are expressions of regret from those who are opposed but who have done *nothing* to help on woman's progress without woman in politics.

My message to your people would be: If you do not intelligently oppose the granting of woman suffrage, you are aiding it and if it is won by the clamoring of the few, you have no right to raise one word of objection, dissent or regret.

The case of Ontario is the case of Australia—political expediency. The present Premier is a weak man, made Premier on the death of Sir James Whitney, who was the strongest of the strong, flatly, openly and honestly opposed to women in politics. Mr. Rowell, leader of the opposition (Liberal) has always been a suffragist chiefly because he thought it would aid the cause of temperance. Since the war the anti-suffragists have not raised a finger in propaganda work, turning their whole organization into a huge Red Cross Society. The suffragists have carried on business as usual and by their threats have managed to influence our weak government with the belief that they could help to turn some men out.

We anti-suffragists do not regret any of the war work we have done. We *do* regret that all Canadian women have to submit to being "rewarded" for war work which it has been our pleasure and privilege to do and in which anti-suffragists have far outnumbered the suffragists. It was the latter who, at this most critical time, lay down all war work and at large expense traveled the country pointing out that they were now ready for their reward.

SUFFRAGISTS CAUGHT "TAKING CHANCES" WITH THE TRUTH

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST is glad to publish the following letter in explanation of the suffrage chart containing numerous blunders which was recently printed in the *Woman's Journal*, the official suffrage organ.

The Woman's Journal

Office of the Publisher,
GEORGE BREWSTER GALLUP,
45 Boutwell Avenue,
Dorchester, Boston.

MISS MINNIE BRONSON,
37 West 39th Street,
New York City.

February 27, 1917.

Dear Madam: In the February issue of the "WOMAN'S PROTEST" you have an article entitled the "Contrast of a Chart with the Truth." In it you say that no one saw fit to sign the chart or assume responsibility for its accurateness. In our issue of February 3 we had a note telling who made the chart and who she represented. I am enclosing the clipping, hoping you will believe the truth of what I say.

Personally, I was much opposed to publishing the chart, as I **was somewhat afraid it might not "hold water."** But other members of our staff **thought it would be all right to take a chance.** If the chart is inaccurate, I personally am very sorry that it ever appeared. But please bear in mind that it was not drawn up in this office.

Yours truly,
(Signed) CARLYLE MORRIS.

Unfortunately, the clipping referred to in the foregoing letter was not enclosed. A most diligent search of the *Woman's Journal* of February 3d fails to give the note containing the name of the author of the chart. The chart appeared in the *Woman's Journal* of January 20th. It was a few days later that Miss Bronson wrote her criticism.

So far, we have been unable to learn the authorship of the chart from the files of the *Woman's Journal* or otherwise. The only statement referring to the chart we can find in the issue of February 3d is the following, printed under the heading of "A Correction" at the bottom of page 3, column 5:

"In your issue of January 20th I saw a very interesting chart showing a comparison of nine laws affecting children and women. I have not been able to analyze the chart exhaustively, but on two points, viz., laws relating to child labor and compulsory education, we find a number of errors. Some States which were marked black have very good laws (New York, New Jersey, Michigan and Missouri, for example) and the chart does not distinguish between States having poor laws or no laws at all. It is therefore impossible to know by what standards a law was judged to be poor, and States like Wyoming appear white, when other States, such as Maryland, Indiana, Tennessee, have better laws than Wyoming's.

"OWEN R. LOVEJOY,
"General Secretary, National Child Labor Committee."

In the long run, it may yet be impressed upon the suffragists that it is dangerous to "take chances" with the truth for the sake of the "cause." The woman who compiled the chart was either invincibly ignorant, or absolutely childish in believing that she could "put over" such statements without getting caught.

The Massachusetts Association has prepared a graphic reproduction of the chart, showing its errors, and giving the facts. Persons interested should apply to the Massachusetts Association.

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT, President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, also may have "thought it would be all right to take a chance" when she made her false charges that the "cause" had been "cheated of five and perhaps more States by willful fraud," and declared later that the attorney-general had said that suffrage had been "counted out" in Nebraska, etc. (See editorial, "Wanted—Evidence, Not Epithet," January PROTEST.)

The Nebraska Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, shortly after Mrs. Catt's charge appeared, published a letter from Mr. Grant G. Martin, Attorney-General of Nebraska in 1914, saying:

"I was attorney-general at the time the amendment was voted upon. I do not remember that the count on the amendment was ever assailed in my presence."

Mrs. Catt, however, still insisted that she had good reason to charge that the amendment had been counted out, and wrote letters, in duplicate, to the New York *Times* and the Omaha, Nebraska, *Bee*, on February 10th, in which she quotes Mr. William E. Reed, the incoming attorney-general (who took office in January, 1915, two months after the election) as saying that "the fellows opposed to woman suffrage feared suffrage might carry by a recount, and so no recount was asked for."

From this Mrs. Catt concluded:

"I believe that it must be fairly evident, even to an anti-suffragist, that I am correct in quoting the attorney-general of Nebraska in 1914 as having challenged the count on the suffrage amendment in Nebraska."

It is *not evident*, "even to an anti-suffragist," that either one of the attorneys-general "challenged the count" in Nebraska. Certainly it was not Mr. Martin in 1914 from his testimony. And it was not Mr. Reed in 1915, on Mrs. Catt's own testimony!

The Omaha *Bee* of February 15, on the same date it published Mrs. Catt's letter, printed on the same page the following editorial:

Recall That Unfounded Charge, Mrs. Catt

Nebraska is threatened with wholly unwarranted and undeserved odium through the charge that the suffrage amendment submitted in this State in 1914 was "counted out." With this charge given circulation by a no less distinguished personage than Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National Women's Suffrage Association, upon the alleged authority of Attorney-General Reed of Nebraska, the damage done, in leading people to believe our 1914 election was corrupted to defeat the will of the people after it was registered, might be incalculable, if not retracted or disapproved.

The fact is that the campaign for the suffrage amendment was waged in Nebraska in 1914 by an aggressive and alert group of men and women who took full advantage of everything in their favor, and, while naturally disappointed in the outcome, no suffragist actively engaged in that campaign ever challenged the result or disputed the returns or impugned the honesty of the count. What then has led Mrs. Catt, now more than two years afterward, to cast suspicion upon the integrity of our election? She produces as testimony a statement attributed to Attorney-General Reed, in which he is loosely quoted by a Lincoln newspaper as saying that "gross errors in counting on amendments were noticed" in some collateral contests and that some members of the last legislature planned moving for a recount on amendments in which they were interested, but decided not to do so for fear the recount would show that other amendments in which they were not interested had carried.

Now, if Mrs. Catt were conversant with our Nebraska constitution and laws, we doubt if she would have seized on this interview (though Mr. Reed is made in it to refer specifically to the suffrage amendment) as furnishing even the flimsiest excuse for the charge that the suffrage amendment was "counted out." For in 1914 four constitutional amendments were submitted for popular endorsement in Nebraska, three directly by the legislature and one—namely, the suffrage amendment—by initiative procedure. Mrs. Catt should know that the votes on an initiated amendment must be counted as marked "for" or "against," a mere majority being required equal to 35 per cent. of the total. She should know also that the three legislature-submitted amendments went on the ballot under the labels of the respective political parties which had approved them and were entitled to have counted as "yes" every straight

party ballot. What Attorney-General Reed referred to was alleged failure of many election boards to count "for" these three amendments all of the ballots in which a cross-mark had been placed in the party circle at the top; but whether these circle ballots were, or were not, counted correctly as required by law would make no difference whatever in the count on the suffrage amendment.

Any recount planned in the 1915 legislature, Mrs. Catt should know, necessarily had reference to legislature-submitted amendments, which might possibly have suffered by ignoring the straight party tickets. There is no intimation anywhere, however, that the suffrage amendment, or any of the three referendum measures voted on at the same time, lost a single tally by intentional miscount, or that a recount, barring accidental mistakes, which usually offset, would give any different footings on the returns.

This further consideration is also to be taken into account that the legislature has absolutely nothing to do with either the count, the canvass or a recount for an initiated measure. Votes upon these proposals are canvassed by the regular canvassing board and take effect upon proclamation by the governor within ten days of the completion of the official canvass, which is at least a month before the new legislature comes into being. With legislature-submitted amendments, on the other hand, the practice has been for the legislature to canvass the vote and to announce it, and in the performance of this duty to exercise an implied power to order a recount. The suffrage amendment, therefore, was at no time within the legislative jurisdiction, every step in the procedure being expressly provided for in the initiative and referendum section of the constitution without the aid or consent of any legislature on earth.

We realize that ours is a complicated and duplicated mechanism of constitution changing, but its intrinsic construction completely refutes the "counted-out" charge to which Mrs. Catt has so thoughtlessly given currency. In fairness to the good name of Nebraska, she ought to recall this charge at once and omit no effort to set us right.

FRAUD!

IN the New York *Times* of January 14, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, charged that the election in West Virginia was "unspeakably corrupt."

> "In the November election," she says, "money was alleged by reputable people to have been used in all parts of the State. One woman, in a precinct of seventy-five voters, saw all except six of them receive money for their votes; another was shown a safe full of dollar bills in packages. * * * Others saw men marched to the polls in groups half drunk, and wholly incompetent, who said as they passed: 'We're goin' to vote agin the ——— women.'
>
> "Many of these women reported that the men approached to ask what they were paying for votes and when they learned that suffragists do not buy votes, they contemptuously responded that the other side did."

Upon the publication of this charge, a letter was addressed to Mr. E. T. England, Attorney-General of West Virginia, asking if the laws of West Virginia provided any punishment for the buying and selling of votes, and if the West Virginia suffragists had brought any indictments on these charges against any men in the State. His reply follows:

January 27, 1917.

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge,
New York.

Dear Madam:

I received your letter in which you claim that it has been charged that the recent defeat of woman suffrage in this State was due to fraud. I have never heard that charge before. In fact there was but little attention paid to this issue in this State; the political matters absorbing about all the attention of the voters. It is a violation in this State under our laws to either sell or buy votes.

We have very strict election laws.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) E. T. England,
Attorney-General.

Now then, why have the West Virginia suffragists failed to bring indictments? What about the one woman who saw sixty-nine men in one precinct receive money for their votes? Who was she? Will she testify against these men?

Or was that *story* a fraud?

On November 11, 1916, *The Woman's Journal*, official suffrage organ, published the notice of a reward of $100 offered before the election by the Ohio County (West Virginia) Equal Suffrage League," for the apprehension and conviction of any person guilty of purchasing or otherwise illegally influencing votes against the equal suffrage amendment at the November election, 1916. Any person furnishing the evidence which shall lead to the apprehension and conviction of any person violating the election law in the respect above mentioned will receive this reward."

The suffragists have never mentioned the payment of this reward, although it is three months since the election! Why doesn't Mrs. Catt, or the "one woman" who saw all the men but six paid for their votes, claim it?

> "Evidences of fraud and irregularities in State campaigns, wilful or otherwise, are so numerous that it would take a book properly to record them," says Mrs. Catt in her original charge.

So far the evidence of fraud is chiefly against the persons making the wild charges, for propaganda purposes.

Mrs. Catt says that she herself "sat at a polling place all day" in the first referendum in South Dakota and "saw illiterate Russian-Germans voted against our amendment by groups of half dozens and the money paid over in plain sight."

What is the court record? Did Mrs. Catt appear as a witness against these illegal voters? If not, why not? Or is this story also intended chiefly for propaganda purposes?

The above article, with no substantial changes, appeared as a letter signed by Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, in the New York *Times* of February 18, under the heading: "Mrs. Catt's Charges—The Attorney General of West Virginia Has Not Heard of Them."

So far as The Protest is able to learn, Mrs. Catt has made no attempt whatever to substantiate her sensational statements about corruption in West Virginia, although it would appear, if one woman saw sixty-nine men receive money for their votes, as Mrs. Catt says, that the suffragists owe her $6,900 for the information, which has not been paid! Why?

Were the suffragists "taking chances"—to get publicity—when the reward was offered? Or do they "take chances" with the truth whenever the "cause" needs a story?

FIRES AND THE FRANCHISE

NOW comes a Cleveland delegation graphically depicting the horrors of the big Triangle factory fire in New York City, where so many girls lost their lives because of inadequate fire protection, claiming the ballot would have saved those girls! But, Madam Suffragist, we are here in Ohio and we are not responsible for the fires in New York. Yet what about the terrible fire in your own town, Cleveland—the Collinwood School Building—where 135 little lives were snuffed out because the doors opened inwards? There was an instance directly under the control of the women themselves, who have the right to vote on all school matters, but they don't take the trouble to do it; they did not even take the trouble to know if those doors opened right. Now they want to vote for Presidents in order to stop fires in New York! Well! Well! What next?—Sara Hartshorne West, in the Columbus, Ohio, *Journal*.

THE COST OF LIVING

To the Editor:

THE suffrage claim that giving women the ballot will reduce the cost of living suggests these random thoughts:

If a farmer by intelligent hard work can raise 300 bushels of potatoes to the acre by planting, cultivating, spraying, and praying for rain, how many more bushels could he raise if his wife voted?

If a woman, in addition to her other work about a farm, can raise forty turkeys without being able to vote, how many more could she raise with the vote?

If a protracted drought threatened the grain crop, would votes for women produce the necessary showers?

If fresh, sweet dairy butter brought thirty-five cents a pound at the maker's own door, would votes for women drop five cents a pound off of the price of that butter, and if they did, who would get the butter?

Would votes for women put more weight on a hog, thereby increasing the supply of meat, or would they reduce the demand in order to hold down the price?

Or is this new line of agitation, possibly, just talk?

I. Wonder.

New York City, January 30, 1917.

THE STATE CAMPAIGNS

FOUR States—North Dakota, Ohio, Indiana and Arkansas, have passed statutory suffrage bills. These bills were passed on the following dates:

North Dakota, passed by legislature January 18, signed by Governor Lynn J. Frazier January 25. To go into effect July 1, 1916.

Ohio, passed Lower House, 72 to 50, February 1; Senate, 20 to 16, February 14; signed by Governor James M. Cox, February 21. To go into effect, 1920.

Indiana, passed by Senate, 32 to 16, February 8; Lower House, 67 to 24, February 22; signed by Governor James P. Goodrich, February 28. Goes into effect April 10, 1917.

Arkansas, passed by Senate, February 16; Lower House, 54 to 27, March 6; signed by Governor Charles H. Brough, at a suffrage mass-meeting, same date.

In the opinion of the best constitutional lawyers of North Dakota, the statutory suffrage bill is unconstitutional in that State, as it provides for no referendum to the voters. The constitution of North Dakota, Section 122, provides that

"No law extending or restricting the right of suffrage shall be in force until adopted by a majority of the electors of the State voting at a general election."

This is clear and definite. The day after the legislature adjourned, the Bismarck *Tribune* and the Grand Forks *Herald* brought out this point. However, the anti-suffragists will not stop at arguing the constitutionality of the bill before the courts. The referendum petition was begun immediately. The anti-suffragists are willing to trust this issue to the sober common sense of the voters of North Dakota—something that the suffragists and the legislators who passed the statutory suffrage bill were unwilling to do.

The referendum will make North Dakota a campaign State.

No difficulty is expected in obtaining the required number of names on the petition. There is another suffrage bill, providing for a referendum on the constitutional amendment in 1918. It must pass the next legislature. It is hardly likely, however, that there will be another campaign in 1918 if the statutory suffrage bill is defeated at the polls in 1917.

In Ohio, the referendum petition is being obtained under competent management. No difficulty is anticipated. The only handicap is the lack of funds necessary for a large canvass of the State. Ohio also will be a campaign State.

In Indiana, suffice it to say that there is a bright chance for the anti-suffragists yet. Plans cannot be published at this time.

One of the first notable incidents after the bill was passed was the statement made by the County Commissioners at Evansville, Indiana, that it would cost the county $40,000 for additional voting machines, and require a redistricting of the city's precincts to accommodate the women voters. There are 35,000 male voters. Provisions have to be made for 20,000 women voters. This is thought to be about the number of women who might vote. As a matter of fact, the number is more likely to be 10,000 or 15,000, and the women's vote is almost certain to be an exact duplicate of the men's—at an additional expense of $40,000 to the county.—See Evansville *Courier*, February 28.

The Arkansas bill allows women to vote in primaries. They must pay a poll tax, swear to support candidates of their party, and meet all suffrage qualifications of male voters. As the primaries are more important than the general elections in States dominated by one party, the law gives women practically full suffrage, without a constitutional amendment.

Maine also will be a campaign State this year, voting on a constitutional amendment September 10th. The bill for submission was passed by the House, 113 to 35, February 21st, and by the Senate, unanimously, February 22d. Maine is a prohibition State since 1884. At that time there were only two woman suffrage States, Wyoming and Utah. Both are still "wet." It will be as difficult to convince Maine voters that women's votes are necessary to make a State dry as it was in West Virginia, and the suffragists have no other plausible campaign appeal sufficient to influence any large class of voters.

Connecticut has four suffrage bills pending: the statutory bill, the constitutional amendment, a bill to allow women to vote on prohibition and on excise measures. The hearing on the constitutional amendment was held on March 7th. Miss Minnie Bronson of New York and Mrs. Frank J. Goodwin of Connecticut spoke for the antis. The hearing on the State-wide prohibition amendment will be held on March 14th. Hearings on the bill to allow women to vote on this measure have already been held.

Delaware defeated woman suffrage by 21 to 12 in the House on February 23d. On the 26th, the Senate defeated the measure. There were 8 for and 6 against, with 3 members absent. The suffragists required 12 votes—or two-thirds of all the members elected—to pass the bill.

Three of the Delaware representatives visited the Washington headquarters during the inauguration and signed against suffrage. They were taken in by one man who declared that he had voted in favor of suffrage "to let the women down easy." Delaware is the only State that can grant women full suffrage without a referendum to the people. It is extremely dangerous for a man to vote against his convictions merely out of sympathy with the suffragists because they are *women*. They cannot help it. Anti-suffragists also are women—and in a majority of over *seventeen to one* in Delaware.

On Thursday, March 1st, the *District of Columbia* Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage opened a most attractive tea and rest room at 1213 Pennsylvania Avenue, along the line of march of the inaugural parade.

It was elegantly decorated with roses, palms and the anti-suffrage colors in large silk streamers, under the personal direction of Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., president of the District Association.

During the parade, thousands of buttons, banners, hat-bands and pamphlets were distributed. The rooms were open until the 10th.

Men and women from all over the country came in and signed in opposition to suffrage, including members of the legislature from several States, and many persons resident in suffrage States.

One woman who signed had recently been in active charge of one of the suffrage enterprises at the Congressional Union headquarters. She stated that intimate acquaintance with the behavior of the Congressional Union suffragists had quite converted her to anti-suffrage. She said: "Their tactics were unbearable."

The *Vermont* legislature defeated a bill providing for woman suffrage on February 21st.

In *New Hampshire* a bill for statutory suffrage was defeated on March 6th, in the House of Representatives, by 204 to 152. It had been defeated previously in the Senate.

North Carolina has passed a bill allowing the voters in certain municipalities to vote on the extension of municipal suffrage to women. A bill for statutory suffrage was defeated in the House, 64 to 42, February 9th.

THE STATE CAMPAIGNS—(*Continued*)

THE Hon. Charles S. Fairchild, former Secretary of the Treasury, and now president of the Men's National Anti-Suffrage Association, announces that the men who assisted the anti-suffragists of New York State in 1915 will do so again in the present campaign.

"We cannot believe," said Mr. Fairchild, "in view of the serious national crisis, that the voters of New York State would make the vital mistake of introducing an entirely new element into the electorate. We are nevertheless prepared to meet the activities of the suffragists by giving our unqualified support to the anti-suffragists."

Among the men endorsing this statement are: George W. Wickersham, James R. Sheffield, Francis S. Bangs, B. Aymar Sands, Ezra P. Prentice, Henry L. Stimson, Francis Lynde Stetson, Frederick De Peyster Foster, Henry Seligman, Herbert Satterlee, Robert Olyphant, Henry A. Wise Wood, Judge Francis M. Scott, George Zabriskie, General Nelson H. Henry, S. B. Chittenden, Everett P. Wheeler, Dr. Charles L. Dana.

Suffrage Lobby a Menace

"After sixty-nine years' agitation and appeal to the people, thus acknowledging that woman suffrage is properly a question for the people to decide, suffragists, realizing that they are beaten and that they will never get suffrage from the voters, are now taking the decision away from the people and putting it in the hands of politicians. The situation is now controlled by highly financed suffrage lobbies in Congress and in the legislatures of twenty-two States."

Miss Mary G. Kilbreth, chairman of Legislative Work of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, so characterizes the latest drive of the suffrage organizations in their nation-wide campaign for statutory suffrage by legislative action.

In *The Suffragist* of February 7, 1917, their methods are explained:

"The center from which all the legislative work is directed and where its results are all put down in black and white is in the legislative office at headquarters. * * * Here is set down the record of every Congressman. Every fact that has any bearing on his personality, opinion and mental make-up is minutely detailed—where he was born, where he went to school, what his special studies were if he went to college, his family, his home, his church, his clubs and his lodges. No detail is overlooked that might give a lobbyist insight into how best to approach him.

"After the index cards of the Congressman's personality there follows his record on the Federal amendment and his present position. * * *

It sounds like the tabulating of specimens in a laboratory.

NEW YORK STATE

Among the notable events of the month was the reception and tea given in Johnstown, which was addressed by Mrs. O. D. Oliphant. In the absence in the South of Mrs. A. M. Banker, chairman of the Johnstown Committee, Mrs. Alfred Denison, Jr., arranged for this meeting. Notwithstanding a blizzard, there was a splendid attendance and great enthusiasm.

The Johnstown Committee is very active and has started a Junior Auxiliary, as well as a Wage Earners' League Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Mrs. George H. Dobbin, an executive member from the Riverside District of New York, has spent several weeks in Johnstown; and is having great success answering questions and "quizzes" at all formal or informal anti-suffrage gatherings.

As a result of the debate in Nyack, under the auspices of the Men's Business Club, for which Mrs. Florence Kelley was brought on from Chicago to debate with Miss Rowe, a strong anti-suffrage committee was organized in Nyack on February 21st. Mrs. Charles A. Smith is chairman; Miss Edith Stillwell, secretary, and Miss Marjorie Tompkins, treasurer.

On February 16th Miss Lucy Price spoke at Wells College, through the courtesy of Mrs. Elbert L. Carpenter of Minneapolis, alumnus and one of the trustees of Wells College.

At a large mass meeting called recently by the Italian residents of a closely congested district in Brooklyn, Miss Charlotte E. Rowe spoke in behalf of a public park and playground. Judging by the enthusiasm, the 1,700 men and women who attended are all ardent antis. This opportunity to speak came by invitation as a direct result of a previous meeting addressed by Miss Rowe. Cardinal Gibbons' address for the National Anti-Suffrage Convention in Washington, December, 1916, was distributed.

The refusal of suffragists to debate has aroused so much adverse criticism that they are constantly being forced to make exceptions, and they are now frequently meeting anti-suffrage speakers in debate.

We are pushing an active campaign through hearings granted us in the Assembly District clubs.

Among the many other meetings scheduled are: Holy Name Society, North Troy, March 5; Hell Gate Republican Club, New York, March 6; Pine Bush Grange, March 9; Labor Forum, debate, New York, March 12; Unionville Grange, March 19; Riverside Republican Club, April 2; Educational Alliance, April 4; Newburgh Grange, April 6; Bullwell Grange, April 9; Washington Heights Forum, April 15.

Miss Lucy Price addressed a Socialist Club on March 2, by request.

Our public Thursday afternoon meetings at headquarters, with speeches and tea, bring great crowds and many new members are being enrolled.

Not only the "neutrals," but many former suffragists are announcing and enrolling themselves antis.

MASSACHUSETTS

FEBRUARY, though a short month, was a busy one. Fifteen meetings and three luncheons indicating much activity throughout the State. The principal feature of the month was the Annual Luncheon on February 16 at the Hotel Somerset. Though the majority of our members are overwhelmed with multitudinous duties in connection with Red Cross and Preparedness work three hundred and twenty found time to attend. Mrs. Balch presided and opened the meeting by offering a resolution to give President Wilson our loyal support in the maintenance of the Nation's integrity which resolution was unanimously adopted by a rising vote. Mrs. William Lowell Putnam then asked for donations to carry on the State and National work, which request met with a generous response. Miss Emily P. Bissell, Secretary of the Delaware Association and Mrs. Annie Riley Hale, author of "Eden Sphinx," were the speakers and were accorded a cordial and enthusiastic reception.

The College Anti-Suffrage League held a meeting February 15 at the residence of Mrs. Thomas Allen, head of the Advisory Board, at which Mrs. Annie Riley Hale was the speaker. The League elected officers with Mrs. Herbert Lyman as president.

The Massachusetts Association through its president was one of the first organizations to offer its services to Governor McCall in event of war.

Mrs. John Balch and Mrs. William Lowell Putnam have accepted an invitation to serve on the Red Cross Committee of Co-Operation. Mrs. Barrett Wendell, another member of our Executive Board, is the President of the Preparedness League.

At the State House hearing on February 8th on a bill to permit women voting in the Constitutional Convention on the ground that "women are people," Mrs. Henry Preston White, Mrs. John Balch, Mrs. Frank Foxcroft and Mr. Robert Luce spoke for the opposition. Later in the month the Committee reported adversely on the bill and the Suffragists were granted leave to withdraw.

Mrs. Thomas Allen on February 6 spoke before the Civics Club, Simmons College, Boston, and on the 8th addressed a large audience of the students of Pembroke College, Providence.

Mrs. B. L. Robinson, president of the Public Interests League, spoke before the House Committee of the Vermont Legislature on February 16th, at the public hearing on the Woman Suffrage bill. The bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 114 to 111.

Mrs. Thomas Nelson Perkins is now Branch Organization Chairman and Miss Catherine Robinson as State Organizer, assisted by Miss Stella Bent as a volunteer, are working under her direction.

Miss Robinson is also speaking at many meetings. On February 20 she spoke to the Benevolent Society of Brockton in the afternoon and in the evening to the Y. W. C. A. girls of Brockton and on the 23d gave a talk to the students of the Connecticut Agricultural College of Storrs, Connecticut.

Upon request of the District of Columbia Association for material to be used in the Anti-Suffrage shop to be opened in Washington Inauguration week, Massachusetts sent a donation of 5000 pieces of literature, diagrams, line maps, posters, etc., for window display and 600 roses.

GEORGIA

THE Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Macon, one of the most active in Georgia, recently held its election of officers; the newly-elected officers are strong Anti-Suffragists. The President, Mrs. G. P. Gastin, was one of the original organizers of the Georgia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage and is a member of the Executive Board of that Association. She is active in church and charitable work, at all times.

Mrs. B. B. Renitz and Mrs. Harriet Sears are also ardent Anti-Suffragists. Mrs. Renitz is Treasurer of the W. C. T. U. and says she works for prohibition and Anti-Suffrage at the same time. She and Mrs. Sears are active workers in the Methodist Church and the Y. M. C. A. Auxiliary. Mrs. Renitz says the color yellow is no longer pretty to her, because it is symbolical of Woman Suffrage.

Mrs. Harriet Sears, the Secretary, is from Chicago and before joining the Anti-Suffragists attended meetings of the suffragists and then told them she had decided to cast her lot with the "Antis." Last summer in Illinois, she saw many suffrage friends and said to them, "If I could show you a thing or two in the South, you would not believe in it."

Miss Mildred Rutherford, for years Historian General of the United Daughters of The Confederacy, Historian for life of the U. D. C.'s, will deliver one of her famous historical lectures at Wesleyan Chapel on March 15th and some of the musical faculty of that college, the oldest woman's college in the world, will be on the evening's program. This is for the benefit of the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, of which Miss Rutherford, of Athens, is a member.

SUFFRAGE REFERENDA TO WOMEN

WISCONSIN women may vote on the extension of suffrage in November, 1918. The bill introduced February 27th, by Senator Reinnoldt, Senate Bill No. 345, is entitled:

"A bill to submit the question of extending suffrage to women to the persons most concerned. And if favored to submit the question of amending section 6.01 of the statutes to the electors."

Section 1 of the bill provides:

"Because the electors of the State are urged to extend suffrage to women and thus impose further duties on this class of citizens now exempt, and for the purpose of ascertaining definitely and certainly of and from those most interested, the women themselves, information and advice upon this question, an election for that purpose shall be held ——, November, 1918, the day of the general election," etc.

The bill requires the board of canvassers to return not only the number of women's votes cast for and against suffrage, but "the percentage of women of voting age, residents of the State, who voted upon said proposition," based upon the last Federal Census (1910).

If 60 per cent. of the women vote on the question, and a majority vote in favor of amending the constitution, "it shall be deemed accepted as the desire of the women and the policy of this State to amend the law." There were 611,157 women of voting age in Wisconsin in 1910. If 366,694 (60 per cent.) vote on the question, the suffragists would need 183,348 women's votes in favor, or a small fraction over 30 per cent. of the women of voting age. So far as statistics show, it is practically impossible to get 60 per cent. of the women of voting age to the polls, even at a Presidential election, when urged by their husbands.

KANSAS

I. N. GREEN of Kiowa, member of the lower house from Barber County, hasn't introduced many bills or resolutions this session of the legislature. But he has a resolution to introduce, if his nerve doesn't fail him, that is some resolution. Green wouldn't do much to the established order of things in Kansas. All he wants to do is this:

Resubmit the suffrage amendment to the constitution, adopted in 1912, to the women voters of the State at the next general election.

"Here is just the situation, as I see it," said Green last night, after he had prepared his resolution. It was to have been introduced last night, but the expected night session was not forthcoming, and Green will have to wait until this morning. "The great majority of the women of the State never wanted suffrage in the first place. They don't want it now. They are going to the ballot box and casting their votes in self-defense merely. If the suffrage amendment could be resubmitted and only the women allowed to vote on it, the women of the State themselves would do away with suffrage."

In his resolution, asking that the Committee on Elections be instructed to bring in within three days a joint resolution calling for a resubmission of the suffrage amendment, Mr. Green says:

"Whereas, A majority of the good women of Kansas are not desirous of exercising the elective franchise, and

"Whereas, They had no say about whether the amendment should be placed in the constitution, and

"Whereas, Such a responsibility and serious burden should not be imposed upon them without their consent; therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives:

"First, That the Committee on Elections be requested and directed to prepare a joint resolution and present the same to this legislature, providing for the resubmission of the woman suffrage amendment to the constitution at the general election, upon which none but the women of the State be permitted to vote."

Then follows the general form of the resolution that Green wishes to have drawn up and presented on the floor of the house by the elections committee, either with a favorable report or without recommendation. E. D. Samson of Gove, is chairman of the Elections Committee.—*Topeka, Kan., Capital*, Feb. 14, 1917.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 280 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman's Relation to Government — *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
Taxation and Suffrage — *Frederick Dwight*
First Legislative Address — *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers
Suffrage a Cult of Self and Sex — *Dr. Charles L. Dana*
Some Catholic Views
Red Behind the Yellow
Suffrage Not a Right — *Hon. Henry L. Stimson*
Woman Will Not Gain by Suffrage — *Judge Edgar M. Cullen*
An Argument Against the Woman Suffrage Amendment — *Stephen H. Olin*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against the Federal Amendment — *Judge Oscar Leser*
A Destruction of the Right of Self-Government — *Hon. Elihu Root*
A Message from His Eminence, James, Cardinal Gibbons
Woman Suffrage and Prohibition — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child — *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. — *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*
Should Women Vote? — *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage — *Reprint from Yale Review*
Dodgers—Statistics

Silk Pins.....10c. each
Celluloid Buttons.....5c.
Ribbon....10c. and 15c. a yard
Pennants.....15c. and 25c.

New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

52 Broadway Room 926 New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound — *Prof. William T. Sedgwick*
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Colorado and Suffrage — *John C. Ten Eyck*
Consent of the Governed — *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals.
The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman — *Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar*
What Women Have Done Without the Ballot — *Everett P. Wheeler*
(Republished by Permission from *The Reply*.)
Price 5 cents each—25 for $1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Feminism ($1.50) — *Mr. and Mrs. John Martin*
The Eden Sphinx ($1.25) — *Mrs. Annie Riley Hale*
Anti-Suffrage Essays—by Massachusetts Women
Woman Adrift ($1.50) — *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) — *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) — *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) — *Ida M. Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) — *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) — *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? — *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel.
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. George A. Caswell*
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) — *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed — *Adapted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage — *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*
Suffrage Statements Answered
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons — *Caroline M. Parker*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage — *Frank Foxcroft*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail — *Mrs. A. J. George* (Independent)
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform — *Margaret C. Robinson*
Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.
Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1917

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....years' subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City.....State .....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....